

**Draft Summary of Cultural Resources Work Group Meeting
Oroville Facilities Relicensing (FERC Project No. 2100)
April 15, 2003**

The Department of Water Resources (DWR) hosted the Cultural Resources Work Group meeting on April 15, 2003 in Oroville.

A summary of the discussion, decisions made, and action items is provided below. This summary is not intended to be a transcript, analysis of the meeting, or to indicate agreement or disagreement with any of the items summarized, except where expressly stated. The intent is to present a summary for interested parties who could not attend the meeting. The following are attachments to this summary.

| | |
|--------------|---|
| Attachment 1 | Meeting Agenda |
| Attachment 2 | Meeting Attendees |
| Attachment 3 | March 2003 Update |
| Attachment 4 | Resource Action Worksheet |
| Attachment 5 | Resource Goals – Cultural Resources |
| Attachment 6 | Part 1 Enterprise Boatramp Draft Resource Action 041503 |
| Attachment 6 | Part 2 Foreman Creek Ramp Draft Resource Action 041503 |
| Attachment 6 | Part 3 Foreman Creek Stabilization Draft Resource Action 041503 |

Introduction

Attendees were welcomed to the Cultural Resources Work Group meeting and objectives were discussed. The meeting agenda and a list of meeting attendees and their affiliations are appended to this summary as Attachments 1 and 2, respectively.

Action Items – February 18, 2003 Cultural Resources Work Group Meeting

A summary of the February 18, 2003 Cultural Resources Work Group meeting is posted on the project web site. The Facilitator reviewed the status of the action item from that meeting as follows:

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Action Item #C46: | Distribute Work Group summary for March 2003. |
| Status: | Janis Offermann, DWR Resource Area Manager, distributed a summary for March activities to Work Group participants via mail. Additional copies were available at the April 15, 2003 meeting and are included as Attachment 3 to this summary. |

Study Plan Implementation Update

Mark Selverston with the consulting team gave an overview of the current status of the inventory effort. He informed the group that a draft report has been submitted to DWR, and he noted that the report includes over four thousand pages of site records.

Michael Delacorte with the consulting team presented an overview of prehistoric findings. He highlighted the fact that more sites were found in the fluctuation zone than at the higher elevations due to dense vegetation. He presented graphs indicating the number of prehistoric sites by geographic area and described the traits that characterize various types of archaeological deposits. He explained that the researchers have classified sites by the type of artifact(s) found.

One participant asked whether the researchers could estimate the age of the oldest site. Michael explained that the chronological framework is not that developed; however, he would guess that the sites are several thousand years old, and he wouldn't be surprised if a few were as old as 8-10 thousand years.

Helen McCarthy gave an update on the ethnographic effort. She announced that 23 people have been interviewed to date, and that a total of 63 interviews have been conducted. The research team has completed 8 or 9 field visits and has utilized two sets of archival collections to complement their data collection efforts. She noted they would continue with interviews, as well as analyzing the data collected. She also announced that a great deal of information pertaining to Foreman Creek has been collected and estimates that 24 village sites and 18 fishing sites have been identified.

Maidu Advisory Council Update

Art Angle updated the participants on the activities of the Maidu Advisory Council. He announced that they completed a site visit to Foreman Creek, with the intention of possibly locating other areas for recreation use that would not impact the cultural resources in the area. He explained that while they did locate some potential areas, these had not been surveyed during the field effort.

Art also explained that woody debris had been collected at McCabe Creek and, now that everyone is aware of the potential impacts the current debris removal practices have on cultural resources they hope to get a more long-term solution for that area.

Resource Action Discussion

The Facilitator gave an overview of the process for identification of potential resource actions or protection, mitigation and enhancement (PM&E) measures. She reminded participants of the issue tracker process and development of the issue sheets. She explained that the Plenary Group approved the use of a Resource Action Identification Form (RAIF) developed by a Plenary Task Force but did not develop criteria for evaluation of resource action proposals, deciding that evaluation would be best discussed within the technical work groups. The facilitator described the identification form as a means of providing additional information about a specific resource action proposal for adequate consideration by the collaborative. The Plenary established RAIF submittal target dates of April 7th, and June 16th, but the Facilitator stressed that these were not meant to be deadlines, rather targets. The earlier the resource actions are identified, the more time there is for analysis. She identified three pathways for a RAIF to be submitted to the collaborative: 1) a participant may submit a RAIF to a specific work group; 2) a stakeholder can submit a RAIF to DWR Program Manager Rick Ramirez; or 3) a work group can collectively develop a RAIF.

The participants acknowledged that many resource actions have already been identified and are contained within the Issue Tracker. Janis Offermann explained that DWR would like to use the Issue Tracker to begin sorting out which of the issues can be addressed by either protection/mitigation or enhancement/settlement resource actions. DWR and its consultants had made an initial effort at making this distinction with each of the resource issues, but the group needed to review the entire list and discuss the proposed distinctions. The work group was reminded that those issues directly related to impacts on cultural resources resulting from operation of the Oroville Facilities will have priority as resource actions due to legal requirements. Janis distributed a Resource Action Worksheet that included the issues from the Cultural Resources section of the Issue Tracker and indicated that the highlighted rows represented issues for which clarification or additional information were needed. The participants reviewed the worksheet and first provided additional information on the highlighted items. The work group then went through the entire list and discussed each issue and its assignment as either a potential

protection/mitigation or enhancement/settlement resource action. The Resource Action Worksheet is provided as Attachment 4 to this summary.

The Facilitator suggested that the next effort could be to group like items on the list together and eliminate any redundancies. The group agreed to let DWR complete this task. The Facilitator distributed a Cultural Resources Resource Goals handout (Attachment 5) and explained that the stakeholder goals listed on the handout are consolidated from the Issue Sheets and should be helpful when completing questions on the RAIF regarding which goal(s) the proposed resource action addresses. She also distributed a sample RAIF and reminded participants that while they may not have answers to all the questions on the form, they should complete as much of it as possible.

Steve Heipel with the consulting team distributed two additional examples of completed RAIFs for cultural resources actions (Attachment 6). The participants discussed the examples, focusing primarily on the proposed boat ramp extension at Enterprise, questioning whether this should be a recreation resource action rather than a cultural resource action. Chris Acken with DWR explained that since the Cultural Resources Work Group had identified a cultural concern with on-going recreational use in the area, it was appropriate for the CRWG to offer a solution to the problem that could meet both cultural and recreational needs, rather than one that might meet only the needs of the Cultural Resources Work Group, such as closure of the Enterprise area to all recreation. Craig Jones representing State Water Contractors noted that this idea could also easily be put forward in the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group and asked if communication between work groups would take place so that no duplication of efforts would occur. Chris Acken explained that communication would continue to take place among DWR Resource Area Managers (RAMs) to keep one another up-to-date on other work groups' activities. The Facilitator added that the Plenary Group discussed cross-resource work group or task force meetings to address specific cross resource issues and that the RAMs have agreed to identify cross-resource issues and set up meetings as necessary to resolve them.

The Facilitator announced that the next meeting would be May 13, 2003 and the discussion of Resource Actions would continue at that time. The next Cultural Resources Work Group meeting will be:

Date: May 13, 2003
Time: 5:30 – 9:30 p.m.
Location: To be determined

Action Items

The following action item identified by the Cultural Resources Work Group includes a description of the action, the participant responsible for the action, and due date.

Action Item #C47: Consolidate identified PM&E/settlement issues.
Responsible: DWR Staff
Due Date: May 2003